1. Copies of site/project notes from DEQ. Several of the notes cover the period of the operation of the FPRS and the monitoring/reporting.
[Note that some of the notes have overlapping pages and duplicated notes; the hard copies provided included several versions of some of the notes with duplicated information. I combined all of them in the PDF so as to not lose any information.)

2. Free Product Recovery System, 1994-2000
-- Final design drawings (July 1994) and "as-builts" (?) (December 1994).
-- Memos and transmittal letters accompanying the design.
-- Construction report.
-- "Quarterly" monitoring reports (Hart Crowser) of FPRS operation and product recovery.
Note that the April 28, 1999 report (#17) describes the discharge to the infiltration trench north of the highway.

-- Spreadsheet prepared by START with notes about the operation of the FPRS (schedule, dates, days operated, etc.) from data provided in Hart Crowser monitoring report.
-- Photos during construction.

3. Containment Barrier, 2000.
Installed in 2000 because the FPRS was not successful at preventing oil seeps to the river.
Includes
--Proposal,
-- JARPA permit,
-- Corrective Action Plan
-- Installation report
-- Site surveys
-- Photos
-- 2006 Failure Analysis and Preliminary Corrective Action Work Plan (Farollan)

4. 2011 FHWA investigation into extent of contamination along ROW (work plan and report).

5. Extent of Plume Maps:
-- 2000 estimate by Potlatch.
-- Figure from EPA EE/CA that shows 2000, 2007, and 2009 plume estimate maps.
-- 2011 FHWA figures 2 (copy of EE/CA 2000, 2007, 2009 figure) and 3 (2011 plume map).
-- Final excavation map from 2012.

6. Spreadsheet: "Avery free product and GW monitoring.xls"
I created this spreadsheet several years ago to collate any available GW level and free product thickness data in the various site monitoring/recovery wells. Much of the data comes from the Hart Crowser quarterly monitoring reports.

I used this to look for trends (i.e., free product levels and thicknesses over time).
One thing to note about free product thickness: the LNAPL in the wells was very viscous and sticky, so some thicknesses may not be very accurate because the oil tended to smear over the gauge (we observed this ourselves during the 2007 EPA Removal Assessment).